arXiv:1211.1038v1 [physics.gen-ph] 29 Oct 2012

Trivial Lorentz Violation and Neutrino Oscillations

Kimihide Nishimura*
Nihon Uniform, 1-4-21 Juso Motoimazato, Yodogawa-ku Osaka 532-0028 Japan
(Dated: November 7, 2012)

There is a special class of Lorentz violation in quantum theory, which does not cause any observational Lorentz violation in the conventional sense, though not completely unphysical. Physical effects can be generated due to the space-time dependence of particle picture. The magnitude of Lorentz violating terms are in this case not directly restricted by the constraints from experimental observations. One of the possible effects emerges in the neutrino oscillations, and other physical consequences are also discussed.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Cp, 14.60.Pq

I. INTRODUCTION

Though the Lorentz invariance of the laws of Nature has been confirmed experimentally at a high precision in various phenomena, the violation of Lorentz invariance has been still extensively studied theoretically expecting that the signal of Lorentz violation will serve as the probe of the laws of physics beyond the standard model and possibly of the Planck scale physics. The idea of Lorentz violation is also considered for explaining the origin of the photon [1–3], the baryon asymmetry of the Universe [4, 5] and the neutrino oscillations [6, 7].

Due to a historical reason, the Lorentz violation is often discussed in connection with the Planck scale physics, since it was thought that the space-time compactification of extra dimensions entails naturally Lorentz violation in string theories [8].

For investigating the effects of Lorentz violation in terms of the ordinary local quantum field theory, Kostelecký and his coworkers invented the idea of the standard model extension (SME) [9]. In this approach, the Lorentz violating terms in the effective Lagrangian are supposed to be very small and possibly suppressed by the inverse powers of the Planck mass in order not to be in conflict with the observational Lorentz invariance.

However, there is an exceptional case unconstrained by the requirement. An example is easily obtained if we perform for some Lorentz invariant theory the field redefinitions parameterized by tensor constants. Then the Lagrangian will appear to break Lorentz invariance. We here call the Lorentz violation of the model which can be transformed by appropriate field redefinitions into the Lorentz invariant one the "trivial Lorentz violation" (TLV).

Recently, the author has found that a chiral SU(2) model can break Lorentz invariance spontaneously if gauge bosons become massive [10]. The effective theory of the model is expected to be equivalent to the Lorentz invariant one under the specific type of field redefinition, which is a local linear phase transformation of a Dirac spinor, parameterized by a constant 4-vector. A vector constant may differ species by species.

We consider here TLV induced by this local phase transformation. Though a model of TLV is equivalent to Lorentz invariant theory, the field redefinition modifies the particle picture of a quantized field. Accordingly, TLV will not be completely unphysical. In this paper, we investigate possible physical effects by considering the TLV extension of the standard model. Due to the apparent resemblance, the introduction of space-time dependent particle characterization is apt to be confused with true Lorentz violation. We distinguish at first these two notions.

II. TRIVIAL LORENTZ VIOLATION

In classical mechanics, adding a constant to a Lagrangian does not alter the equations of motion and therefore the constant is ordinarily regarded as irrelevant for physics. In relativistic mechanics, however, this term breaks Lorentz invariance. The breakdown of Lorentz invariance by an additive constant belongs to the class of trivial Lorentz violation if quantized. In this case, even an arbitrarily large constant in a Lagrangian will not conflict with relativistic dynamics.

As an illustration, we consider the Lagrangian of a relativistic free particle with a constant a:

$$S = \int dtL = \int -m\sqrt{dx^2} - adt, \qquad (1)$$

where the last term breaks Lorentz invariance. In a general Lorentz frame the action (1) takes the form

$$S = \int -m\sqrt{dx^2} - a_\mu dx^\mu, \qquad (2)$$

where

$$a^\mu = a\bar{u}^\mu = \frac{a}{\sqrt{1-w^2}}(1, -\boldsymbol{w}), \qquad (3)$$

and $\boldsymbol{w}$ is a velocity vector of a new Lorentz frame with respect to the original. The trivial Lorentz violation is in this case characterized by a single time-like constant

---

*Electronic address: kmdns@tune.ocn.ne.jp

4-vector, which in turn selects the special Lorentz frames where spatial components of a^μ vanish.

Though irrelevant for dynamics the presence of a^μ shifts the canonical 4-momentum p^μ as follows,

$$p^\mu = k^\mu + a^\mu, \tag{4}$$

which satisfies

$$(p-a)^2 = m^2, \tag{5}$$

where k^μ is the kinematical 4-momentum defined by

$$k^\mu = (\frac{m}{\sqrt{1-v^2}}, \frac{m\boldsymbol{v}}{\sqrt{1-v^2}}). \tag{6}$$

We next consider quantum theory. The Lagrangian density of a Dirac fermion corresponding to (2) is given by

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\psi}_+[\gamma^\mu(i\partial_\mu - a_\mu) - m]\psi_+, \tag{7}$$

The constant vector a^μ breaks Lorentz and CPT invariance at the Lagrangian level. When various kinds of fermions exist, it may differ species by species. We call a fermion with its intrinsic vector potential a quasi fermion, for distinction.

Though this type of Lorentz violation has been considered already in the literature when a^μ is extremely small [9], some overlaps in explaining the general properties of quasi fermions are unavoidable in view of completeness.

The equation of motion of the quasi fermion gives the same relation as (5), from which we have the solutions

$$p^0 = \pm\sqrt{(\boldsymbol{p}-\boldsymbol{a})^2 + m^2} + a^0. \tag{8}$$

Ordinarily, the solution with a negative root square is not allowable since then the spectrum becomes unbounded below and the vacuum would be unstable. In this case the hole interpretation should be applied to the negative root solution. Then we have the dispersion relation

$$p^0 = \sqrt{(\boldsymbol{p}\mp\boldsymbol{a})^2 + m^2} \pm a^0, \tag{9}$$

which satisfies

$$(p\mp a)^2 = m^2, \tag{10}$$

where the lower sign corresponds to an anti-fermion. In either case, the particle velocity is given by the group velocity

$$\boldsymbol{v} = \frac{\partial p^0}{\partial \boldsymbol{p}} = \frac{\boldsymbol{p}\mp\boldsymbol{a}}{p^0 \mp a^0}, \tag{11}$$

from which and (10), we see that $\boldsymbol{v}^2 < 1$ for a massive fermion and $\boldsymbol{v}^2 = 1$ for a massless fermion in accordance with the ordinary relativity theory. The canonical 4-momentum p^μ is rewritten in the particle picture as

$$p^\mu = k^\mu \pm a^\mu. \tag{12}$$

The results (12) and (10) contrast to the expressions (4) and (5) in classical mechanics.

One of the noticeable features of (12) is the possible breakdown of the positivity of energy when $|m| < a^0$. However, this does not cause any catastrophe to the vacuum since the negative energy is bounded below.

Another feature is the interrelation of potential terms $\pm a^\mu$ between a fermion and an anti-fermion. This term shows CPT violation, as is easily understood from the expression (7), since the vector bi-spinor $\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi$ is CPT odd. However, the detectability of Lorentz or CPT violation depends on the nature of interactions and phenomena, as will be discussed later.

According to the above argument the quasi fermion operator ψ_+ and the ordinary Dirac operator ψ are in the following relation

$$\psi(x) = e^{ia\cdot x}\psi_+(x), \tag{13}$$

or in the mode expansion,

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_+(x) = &\ \textstyle\sum_{s\boldsymbol{p}} q_{s\boldsymbol{p}} U_{s\boldsymbol{p}} e^{-ipx} + \bar{q}^\dagger_{s\boldsymbol{p}} V_{s\boldsymbol{p}} e^{i\bar{p}x} \\ = &\ \textstyle\sum_{s\boldsymbol{k}} a_{s\boldsymbol{k}} u_{s\boldsymbol{k}} e^{-i(k+a)x} + b^\dagger_{s\boldsymbol{k}} v_{s\boldsymbol{k}} e^{i(k-a)x},\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

which implies that the vacuum is common for both ψ and ψ_+, and a quasi fermion with momentum p^μ is equivalent to an ordinary fermion with momentum $k^\mu = p^\mu - a^\mu$, while a quasi anti-fermion with momentum $\bar{p}^\mu$ is equivalent to an ordinary anti-fermion with momentum $k^\mu = \bar{p}^\mu + a^\mu$. The scattering amplitudes are therefore calculable in terms of ordinary fermions ψ by (13) and replacing the initial and final states with those of corresponding ordinary fermions:

$$\langle p_i'|S_q|p_i\rangle = \langle k_i'|S|k_i\rangle, \tag{15}$$

where the scattering operators S and S_q are related by the field redefinition (13). If the operator S obtained from S_q is Lorentz invariant, the conservation of 4-momentum will give the factor

$$\delta^4(\sum_{i=1}^{N'} k'^\mu_i - \sum_{i=1}^{N} k^\mu_i) = \delta^4\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N'} p'^\mu_i - \sum_{i=1}^{N} p^\mu_i - (F'-F)a^\mu\right), \tag{16}$$

where F and F' are the fermion numbers of initial and final states, respectively. If interactions conserve the fermion number, the canonical 4-momentun conservation holds also for quasi fermions.

When there are various kinds of quasi fermions with vector potentials a^μ_α, the conservation of the total canonical momentum holds only when the condition

$$\sum_\alpha (F'_\alpha - F_\alpha)a^\mu_\alpha = 0, \tag{17}$$

is satisfied, where F_α and F'_α are the numbers of quasi fermions of species α appearing in the initial and final states.

Incidentally, it is natural to suppose that all the space components of constant vectors a_α^μ disappear simultaneously in some fiducial Lorentz frame, if the origin of a_α^μ is due to some spontaneous Lorentz violation, as expected from the results of the preceding paper [10]. Then the condition (17) reduces to

$$\sum_\alpha (F'_\alpha - F_\alpha) a_\alpha = 0. \tag{18}$$

When we move to another Lorentz frame, the dispersion relation is altered correspondingly.

In the Big Bang Cosmology there exists a special reference frame in which the cosmological background radiation looks isotropic. If our galaxy is at rest in the comoving frame the velocity of the solar system is approximately $w = v/c \sim 10^{-3}$. In addition, the velocity of the Earth in the solar system is $w \sim 10^{-4}$ and the rotational velocity of the Earth on its own axis is $w \sim 10^{-6}$ at the equator.

If we identify the frame in which spacial components of a^μ vanish with this comoving frame, the proper velocity of an observer on the Earth is safely regarded as less than 10^{-3}. Therefore the magnitude of observer dependence of the dispersion relation will be of the same order as w.

On the other hand, the local phase transformation of ψ can calibrate any Lorentz frame into the fiducial Lorentz frame. In this view, the fiducial Lorentz frame needs not to be identical with the comoving frame.

In either case, if the proper velocity w is small, the dispersion relation to an observer not in the fiducial frame can be obtained approximately by expanding it with respect to w. From (9) with (3), we have the dispersion relation

$$p^0 = \omega \pm a(1+\frac{w^2}{2}) \pm a\frac{\boldsymbol{p}\cdot\boldsymbol{w}}{\omega} + \frac{a^2}{2\omega}\left[w^2 - (\frac{\boldsymbol{p}\cdot\boldsymbol{w}}{\omega})^2\right], \tag{19}$$

up to $O(w^2)$, where $\omega = \sqrt{\boldsymbol{p}^2 + m^2}$ and the lower sign corresponds to a quasi anti-fermion. We have already taken into account the reversal of the direction of spacial momentum for a quasi anti-fermion.

The alteration of dispersion relations depending on the frame of reference implies that the particle properties change depending on observers. Then the magnitude of Lorentz violation depends on the proper velocity of an observer with respect the fiducial frame.

III. PHYSICAL EFFECTS OF TLV

As shown in the precedent paper [10], the spontaneous Lorentz violation of a chiral SU(2) model suggests for leptons a specific type of trivial Lorentz violation, in which the constant vector potentials a_l^μ are obtained by replacing a in (3) with $a_l = m_l/2$ where $l = (e, \mu, \tau)$. Then the quasi neutrinos ν_{l+} and the charged quasi leptons l_- have the following free Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_0 = \sum_{l=e,\mu,\tau} & \bar{\nu}_{l+}\gamma^\mu(i\partial_\mu - a_{l\mu})\nu_{l+} \\ & + \bar{l}_-[\gamma^\mu(i\partial_\mu + a_{l\mu}) - m_l]l_-.\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

The Lorentz violating Lagrangian (20) returns to the Lorentz invariant one by the local phase transformations

$$\nu_l = e^{+ia_l\cdot x}\nu_{l+}, \ l = e^{-ia_l\cdot x}l_-, \tag{21}$$

where ν_l is a Dirac spinor for an ordinary neutrino, while l is that for an ordinary charged lepton.

We rewrite in this section the leptonic sector of the standard model to incorporate the trivial Lorentz violation, and examine the detectable consequences from it. The incorporation of TLV into SM is implemented by rewriting ν_l and l in terms of ν_{l+} and l_- in accordance with (21). Then the model thus redefined would scarcely show any sign of observational Lorentz violation.

Gauge currents appeared in the leptonic sector of SM can be rewritten as

$$-e\bar{l}_-\gamma^\mu l_-, \tag{22}$$

for the electromagnetic currents of charged quasi leptons,

$$\frac{g}{2\sqrt{2}}e^{2ia_l\cdot x}\bar{l}_-\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)\nu_{l+}, \tag{23}$$

for the charged weak currents and

$$\begin{aligned}&-\tfrac{g}{4\cos\theta_W}\bar{\nu}_{l+}\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)\nu_{l+}, \\ &\tfrac{g}{4\cos\theta_W}\bar{l}_-\gamma^\mu(1-4\sin^2\theta_W-\gamma_5)l_-,\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

for the weak neutral currents. We notice that an extra phase factor emerges only in a charged weak current, which indicates the breakdown of the translational invariance as well as of the conservation of the energy-momentum tensor in the quasi lepton picture, though the theory still satisfies Poincaré invariance in the ordinary picture of leptons.

We examine first the QED sector of the redefined standard model in more detail. Since the electro-magnetic current (22) is invariant under the field redefinition, a lepton and a quasi-lepton have the same electro-magnetic properties. The scattering amplitudes are also the same as those for ordinary leptons. The sum of canonical 4-momenta conserves as ever in the quasi-lepton picture.

The canonical energy-momentum tensor, which is obtained as a Noether current is asymmetric on μ and ν, and given by

$$T_c^{\mu\nu} = \bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu i\partial^\nu\chi, \tag{25}$$

for the Dirac fermion $\chi = \psi$ and the quasi fermion $\chi = \psi_+$, respectively. According to (25), the Dirac fermion has the expectation value

$$\langle\int d^3x T_c^{\mu\nu}\rangle = \frac{k^\mu k^\nu}{\omega}, \tag{26}$$

while the quasi fermion has

$$\langle\int d^3xT_c^{\mu\nu}\rangle_+=\frac{k^\mu p^\nu}{\omega}, \tag{27}$$

However, if we perform the phase transformation to $T_c^{\mu\nu}$ of a Dirac fermion, we have

$$T'^{\mu\nu}_c=\bar{\psi}_+\gamma^\mu(i\partial^\nu-a^\nu)\psi_+. \tag{28}$$

Then $\langle T'^{\mu\nu}_c\rangle_+$ gives the same result as (26) even for a quasi fermion. A question naturally arises which of the two is relevant for physics.

The discrepancy disappears when the quasi fermion has the electromagnetic interactions. In this case, the photon part of the canonical energy-momentum tensor $T_\gamma^{\mu\nu}$ also contributes to the total $T^{\mu\nu}$, but this part is not gauge invariant. Rewriting the canonical $T_\gamma^{\mu\nu}$ in terms of the gauge invariant $T_A^{\mu\nu}$, we have

$$T_\gamma^{\mu\nu}=T_A^{\mu\nu}-j^\mu A^\nu, \tag{29}$$

where a fermion bi-linear part appears also from the photon part. Incorporating this part into $T_c^{\mu\nu}$ we have the gauge invariant energy momentum tensor for ψ,

$$T_\psi^{\mu\nu}=\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu i\nabla^\nu\psi, \tag{30}$$

where $\nabla_\mu=\partial_\mu+ieA_\mu$. If we perform the local phase transformation from ψ to ψ_+ on (30), the constant vector potential mixes into the gauge freedom of the electromagnetic potential and will not cause any physical effect.

In addition, even though the equations of motion of a quasi-lepton contains Lorentz and CPT violating term, the equations of motion for physical quantities preserve the same form under the local phase transformation. Actually, we see that the ordinary expression

$$\partial_\mu T_\psi^{\mu\nu}=F^\nu{}_\rho j^\rho, \tag{31}$$

holds irrespective of the presence or the absence of a^μ. Above considerations imply that TLV shows no Lorentz or CPT violation and does not cause any asymmetry between the motions of an electron and a positron in the electromagnetic interactions. Therefore either (25) or (28) can be adopted as the definition of the energy-momentum tensor of a quasi fermion without any contradiction. As a result, the electro-magnetic interaction could not distinguish whether the observed electron is a Dirac fermion or a quasi fermion.

The above observation may immediately be extensible to any charged fermion with any neutral current interactions including even QCD, if the constant potential terms are assumed to be independent of color degrees of freedom. However, one caution is in order.

According to the consequences in the preceding paper, TLV is easily extensible to quarks by replacing a in (3) with

$$a_q=\pm\frac{\sqrt{m_{u_q}^2+m_{d_q}^2}}{2}, \tag{32}$$

where q runs from 1 to 3, and m_{u_q} and m_{d_q} are the quark doublet masses of the q-th generation. Then it is natural to suppose that the quasi quark doublets are described by the following effective free Lagrangian:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_0=\sum_{q=1}^{3}\ &\bar{u}_{q+}[\gamma^\mu(i\partial_\mu-a_{q\mu})-m_{u_q}]u_{q+}\\ &+\ \bar{d}_{q-}[\gamma^\mu(i\partial_\mu+a_{q\mu})-m_{d_q}]d_{q-}.\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where u_q runs over u, c and t, while d_q over d, s and b. The color degrees of freedom have been suppressed. Though any single extra term can be gauged away, the gauge transformation of the electromagnetic potential can not eliminate all the constant potential terms simultaneously. As a result, under a suitable situation that various kinds of fermions play roles at the same time, some residual physical effect may be expected, for example, in thermal equilibrium states.

In the preceding paper the baryon asymmetry has been calculated in the quasi fermion picture and the result agreeing well with the observational value has been obtained.

We next consider charged weak interactions. Since (23) has a local phase factor and changes the species of fermions, the canonical 4-momentum conservation does not hold in the quasi fermion picture. Then only the energy-momentum tensor (28) has the physical relevance for a quasi fermion. However, this does not mean that the observed fermions are not quasi fermions. A possibility to detect TLV remains in the neutrino sector.

Before entering into the consideration on the neutrino oscillations, we finally consider an influence of TLV on the classical gravity. Due to the Bianchi identity, the source term of the Einstein equation should be the conserved symmetric energy momentum tensor, which is given by

$$T_\pm^{\mu\nu}=\frac{1}{4}\bar{\psi}_\pm(\gamma^\mu i\nabla_\pm^\nu+\gamma^\nu i\nabla_\pm^\mu)\psi_\pm+\text{h.c.}, \tag{34}$$

in the absence of gauge interactions, where $\nabla_{\pm\mu}=\partial_\mu\pm ia_\mu$. This gives k^μ as the 4-momentum of a quasi fermion, which excludes the effect of the potential term. Therefore the Lorentz violating potentials will not contribute to gravity, at least as the primary source.

There is an argument in [9] that the symmetric energy-momentum tensor does not conserve for a fermion with $a^\mu\neq 0$. However, the conserved symmetric $T^{\mu\nu}$ is still definable by (34). The moral of this observation is to distinguish between the 4-momentum appeared in dispersion relations and that obtained from $T^{\mu\nu}$. The 4-momentum measured by experiments are based on the conservation laws, and therefore corresponds to the value of the conserved $T^{\mu\nu}$. On the other hand, the 4-momentum appeared in the dispersion relation as well as in the phase factor of a wave function are canonical, not the kinematical quantities. Whether the quasi fermions reveal the effects of Lorentz and CPT violation depends on whether the phenomenon originates due essentially to the quantum phase of a particle. Even for the quasi fermion the kinematical 4-momentum should be assigned often in scattering amplitudes.

IV. NEUTRINO OSCILLATIONS

Since neutrinos are electrically neutral, the extra potential term can play a genuine role. The neutrino mixing provides this possibility. We suppose that neutrinos in charged weak currents are not in mass eigenstates but a linear combination of them:

$$\nu_l' = \sum_{l'} U_{ll'} \nu_{l'}, \tag{35}$$

Then TLV substitutes

$$\sum_{l'} U_{ll'} e^{ia_{l'}\cdot x} \nu_{l'+}, \tag{36}$$

for ν_l', where $U_{ll'}$ are the elements of some unitary matrix. In this case, the phase factors do not cancel and the trivial Lorentz violation will cause physical effects. For the two flavor mixing $\nu_\mu \leftrightarrow \nu_e$, the neutrino oscillation is given by

$$|\langle \nu_{\mu+}' | \nu_{\mu+}'(t)\rangle|^2 = 1 - \sin^2 2\theta_{12} \sin^2 \frac{\Delta(p^0 - a^0)t}{2}, \tag{37}$$

where θ_{12} is a mixing angle and $\Delta(p^0 - a^0) = (p^0 - a^0)_\mu - (p^0 - a^0)_e$ in the detector frame.

According to the result (19), we obtain as the dispersion relations for a quasi neutrino and a quasi antineutrino,

$$p^0 = |\boldsymbol{p}| \pm \frac{m}{2}(1 + \frac{w^2}{2}) \pm \frac{m}{2}\boldsymbol{e}\cdot\boldsymbol{w} + \frac{m^2}{8|\boldsymbol{p}|}(\boldsymbol{e}\times\boldsymbol{w})^2, \tag{38}$$

up to $O(w^2)$, where $\boldsymbol{e}$ is the unit vector parallel to momentum $\boldsymbol{p}$. We see from this expression that a quasi neutrino acquires the effective mass

$$m_\nu = \frac{m}{2}|\boldsymbol{e}\times\boldsymbol{w}|, \tag{39}$$

for a moving observer with velocity $\boldsymbol{w}$.

It may appear paradoxical that even though a quasi neutrino develops mass m_ν, it still moves with the luminal velocity. However, m_ν is not a constant, but depends on the proper velocity of an observer and is also anisotropic. It is easily confirmed from the approximate expression (38) that a quasi neutrino moves with the luminal velocity up to $O(w^2)$.

The measurement of the neutrino oscillation needs to compare the neutrino beam at the detector with that at the source. However, assuming the vanishing mass of neutrino in the source frame will be equivalent to calibrating the source frame into the fiducial Lorentz frame.

If the relative motion of the detector with respect to the neutrino source is rotational, then $\boldsymbol{e}\cdot\boldsymbol{w} = 0$ in (38), and we have

$$\Delta(p^0 - a^0) = \frac{(m_\mu^2 - m_e^2)w^2}{8|\boldsymbol{p}|}, \tag{40}$$

which implies that the observed difference of the neutrino mass squared $\Delta m^2 = 10^{-5} \sim 1(\mathrm{eV})^2$ corresponds to $w = 10^{-11} \sim 10^{-8}$. If we further assume that the proper motion of the detector is due to the revolution of the Earth on its own axis and the baseline is in the North-South direction at the latitude $\pi/4$, then the above value of w corresponds to the baseline length $10^{-2} \sim 10$ km.

According to the quasi neutrino picture, the neutrino mass is not an intrinsic property, but generated due to the proper motion of an observer. This mechanism of the neutrino mass generation differs from that in any other Lorentz violation scenario of the neutrino oscillations. This point of view may modify the interpretation of experimental results and conclusions from them.

The intention of this paper is not to reproduce all the experimental results solely from the quasi neutrino picture, but to show that the quasi neutrino picture can generate or influence on phenomena known as the neutrino oscillations.

V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

A simple field redefinition can mimic Lorentz violation. This observation exhibits the relevance of the Lorentz violation not only for phenomena in the Planck scale, but also in ordinary energy scales. We considered here the "trivial lorentz violation", which is generated by the linear local phase transformation of a spinor field. This transformation introduces a constant vector potential in the kinetic term for a fermion and change some Lorentz invariant model into a model of Lorentz violation. However, despite of its appearance, the theory is equivalent to Lorentz invariant one. Accordingly, the detection of TLV even with large Lorentz violating terms will be difficult. This property contrasts to the true Lorentz violation in which Lorentz violating terms should be extremely small due to experimental constraints.

On the other hand, since TLV is essentially an introduction of some space-time dependence to the particle picture of quantum fields, the detection of TLV will be possible in the phenomena of flavor mixings.

In the extension of the standard model of leptonic sector, one of the possibilities to detect TLV exists in the neutrino oscillations. In this case, the neutrino masses are not constant but depend on the proper motion of an observer. An explicit evaluation is made for a specific type of TLV which is derived from the chiral SU(2) model of spontaneous Lorentz violation presented in a precedent paper [10].

The significance of the observations made in this paper consists in the following. Though the Lorentz violation has been discussed from various view points, it has been assumed without exception that Lorentz violating terms are extremely small in order not to conflict with experimental constraints. The trivial Lorentz violation proposed here provides an exception. An observable effect of TLV are extremely restrictive and, even if it becomes observable as in the case of the neutrino oscillations, the magnitude will be regularized by the proper velocity of an observer in the fiducial Lorentz frame, which is ordinarily expected to be very small.

One may think that since TLV is a simple field redefinition, it is irrelevant for the true Lorentz violation. However, this is not true. In the model of spontaneous Lorentz violation proposed in a preceding paper [10], quasi fermions with the dispersion relations of TLV type emerge, where the Lorentz violating potentials are of the oder of fermion masses. This observation does not only imply that there is a case that even a large Lorentz violating term is not contradictory to the observed Lorentz invariance, but also suggests a possibility that the spontaneous Lorentz violation may generate an effective field theory equivalent to some Lorentz invariant one.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks H. Kunitomo for valuable comments and T. Kugo for useful correspondences.

---

[1] G. S. Guralnik, Phys. Rev. 136, B1404 (1964).
[2] Y. Nambu, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. Extra No., 190 (1968).
[3] T. Eguchi, Phys. Rev. D14, 2755 (1976).
[4] O. Bertolami, Don Colladay, V.Alan Kostelecký and R. Potting, Phys. Lett. B395 178 (1997).
[5] Sean M. Carroll and Jing Shu, Phys. Rev. D73 103515 (2006).
[6] V. Alan Kostelecký and Matthew Mewes, Phys. Rev. D69 016005; D70 031902, 076002 (2004).
[7] Jorge S. Díaz, V. Alan Kostelecký, Phys. Lett. B700, 25 (2011); Phys. Rev. D85 016013 (2012).
[8] V. A. Kostelecký and S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. **D39**, 683 (1989); **D40**, 1886 (1989); Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 224 (1989)
[9] D. Colladay and V. Alan Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D55 6760 (1997); D58 116002 (1998).
[10] Kimihide Nishimura, arXiv:1205.2689 (2012).